

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Graham	Portman	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The nomination is discharged and will be placed on the calendar.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 848, Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

NAYS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Minnesota.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today at a pivotal time for women's rights in this country. I want to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURRAY and many others, including Senator BALDWIN, for their leadership on this issue and on the Women's Health Protection Act.

We learned last week that it is very likely that the Supreme Court will overrule Roe v. Wade. The leaked opinion made it clear. It means the Supreme Court is on track to completely overrule Roe, stripping women of their constitutional right to seek an abortion. It will also be, I note, against the wishes of the somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of Americans who believe that this is a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor—not with Senator CRUZ, not a bunch of politicians in Washington, but a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor.

Fifty years stripped away of women's rights, and the fall will be swift. Over

20 States already have laws in place that could be used to restrict access, including 13 which will automatically go into effect if the Supreme Court issues the decision. We have also seen States preparing to take even more extreme steps if Roe is overturned. Last week, Republican lawmakers in Louisiana advanced a bill to immediately classify abortion as homicide and allow the State to prosecute women—prosecute women—for receiving care. Earlier this year, a bill was introduced by Republican legislators in Missouri to allow private citizens to sue people who help women leave the State to get care. This comes on top of the 19 States that already have laws in place to ban or restrict access to medication abortion.

What this all comes down to is a fundamental question: Who is making these personal decisions—politicians or a woman? And are women equal citizens under the law? If Roe is overturned, women in this country will receive different treatment under the law than men, and our access to critical care will be at the mercy of a patchwork of laws.

We have all seen what happens on the ground when these kinds of restrictions are enacted. Texas's law last year denies access to at least 85 percent of patients seeking abortion-related services. Some women in Texas have had to drive nearly 250 miles one way to get care. No one should have to take a bus across the country to make a personal healthcare decision. A woman in Louisiana or in Missouri or in Texas should not be treated differently than a woman in Minnesota.

While we are all deeply disturbed by the impact this decision will have on women and the men who stand with them, unfortunately, many of us have seen this coming. Republicans have been methodically preparing for this moment, stacking the courts with judges who want to overturn Roe and introducing over 500 bills in States across the country limiting access to care.

While this is still a draft decision, I am seriously concerned that the Court's apparent willingness to disregard nearly 50 years of rights will not only put women's health at risk but will undermine the rule of law.

This draft leaked opinion brings us back to the fifties. The issue is, we always thought it would be the 1950s when it is truly the 1850s. The people of this country do not want to go backwards when it comes to their freedoms, because that is what this is about—their freedom to make their own decisions.

So what can the Senate do in the face of this threat to freedom? All three branches of the government have a responsibility to protect people's rights, and if one branch doesn't do its job—that is how this system was set up constitutionally—then it is up to another to step in.

Congress must act to codify the principles of Roe v. Wade into law, and we